

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-36. Claims 1, 7, 15, 17, 25-29 and 34-36 are amended herein, and new claim 37 is added. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-37 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,794,207 (Walker).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of Walker's sales events in relation to a conditional purchase offer (CPO) between a buyer and a seller with the present invention. On page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Walker's aggregate record teaches "selection" of the buyer or seller records in the claimed invention. However, Walker is limited to collective or aggregate processing of sales events of a particular CPO and does not allow sales events to be individually processed (see, col. 24, lines 31-46 and col. 26, lines 47-50). That is, Walker is limited to pairing sale event(s) specifying a subject of goods to a corresponding CPO and processing the sale event(s) having the specified subject of goods in aggregate using a purchase confirmation (see, col. 8, lines 42-56 and col. 13, lines 40-44).

In contrast to Walker, the present invention is not limited to confirming an aggregated total of a buyer's or a seller's sales data. For example, a buyer is able to include items from different seller records in a confirmation document by selecting information of a sale and sales data is correspondingly selected (i.e., processing is not limited to aggregate sales data).

Independent claims 1, 7, 17, 25-29 and 35 as amended recite that the present invention includes creating or making a "confirmation", "notarization", or "confirmatory" document for "a selected sale and corresponding sales data of at least one item among seller records" ("a corresponding voucher" in claim 35). Similarly, independent claim 15 recites that a notarization document is created by the seller for "a selected sale and corresponding sales data of at least one item from a corresponding buyer record."

Independent claim 34 as amended recites, "payment object indicating a selected sale and corresponding to the sales data of at least one item among the plurality of seller sales records" that is created upon receipt of "a plurality of seller sales records."

Independent claim 36 recites, “automatically determining delivery vouchers of the seller corresponding to the selected sale of the seller records” and “authenticating the confirmation document with the delivery vouchers.”

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Walker.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Walker. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 10, “said seller checks said detailed payment statement against documents stored in memory according to said memory means”. Walker does not teach or suggest these features of claim 10.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 37 recites, “enabling the buyer to select a single sale record including corresponding sales data of at least one item from seller records of sold items” and “automatically determining delivery vouchers of the seller corresponding to the single sale record.”

Walker does not teach or suggest selection of “a single sale record” and “automatically determining delivery vouchers” corresponding to the single record, as recited in claim 37. Instead, Walker pairs sale events to a corresponding CPO for aggregate processing (see, col. 8, lines 42-56 and col. 13, lines 40-44).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 37 is distinguishably patentable over Walker.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/184,587

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/2/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501